

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/507,465	02/22/2000	Rodney C. Langley	M4065.0018/P018-A	2423

7590 11/29/2001

Thomas J D'Amico Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP 2101 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037-1526

EXAMINER					
ANDERSON, MATTHEW A					
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER				

1765 DATE MAILED: 11/29/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ME
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/507,465	LANGLEY ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew A. Anderson	1765	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addres	SS
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2001 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper reply ich places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	han SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The datheve been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nsion and the corresponding amount of the distance of the distance of the distance of the corresponding the corresponding amount of the corres	e fee. The appropriate extens the final Office action; or (2)	sion fee under as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:		
(a)   they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
<ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed a	mendment
5.☑ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for application in condition for allowance because: Section 2.5.		sidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.			
Claim(s) objected to: none.			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10, 12-16</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01)

10. Other:

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

Centinuation Sh et (PTO-303) 09/507,465

27



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the combination cited suggests the apparatus claimed by the applicant. The examiner has set forth a motivation for the combination presented. The applicant can not make the case that there is no motivation for the combination if he merely chooses not to recognize the motivation that is presented. The applicant's argument that the "expected result" of a rotatable pedestal was beyond those of ordinary skill in the art is not convinciing in that the rotation was suggested by Nakayama et al. as ensuring the uniform flow of gases over the substrate (col. 7 lines 15-25) and that the gas flow would be equally applicable to plasma etching systems (col. 9 lines 20-30).

BENJAMIN L. UTECH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700